



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/708,179	11/07/2000	Satoshi Nakajima	41020.P003	1119
25943	7590	09/28/2005	EXAMINER	
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C. PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900 1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE PORTLAND, OR 97204			TRAN, PHILIP B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/708,179

Applicant(s)

NAKAJIMA, SATOSHI

Examiner

Philip B. Tran

Art Unit

2155

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 06 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None.

Claim(s) objected to: None.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-4, 6-8, 10-16, 18-21 and 23-26.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.

Philip Tran

Philip B. TRAN

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Marashita clearly teaches the claimed invention of compressing and decompressing tag document such as SGML document with transmitting a list of said unique constituting elements (dictionary of tags) in the order of their occurrence frequencies to allow a receiver of said list of said unique constituting elements to infer the corresponding cookie representations of the unique constituting elements and transmitting said data structure in a representative form encoded with said cookie representations. That is, outputting code information (data structure) in compressed form to the decoding side wherein the data structure is decompressed based on the frequency of occurrence of tag [see Marashita, Abstract and Figs. 11-13 and Page 2, Line-10-58 and Page 19, Line 42 to Page 20, Line 52]. Thus, Marashita does teach or suggest "transmitting a list of said unique constituting elements in the order of their occurrence frequencies..." as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

Claim 13 contains similar limitations as claim 1 and therefore claim 13 is rejected under the same rationale set forth to claim 1. Claims 8 is not similar to claim 1 as argued by applicant and therefore claim 8 is rejected differently as indicated in the Final Office Action sent out on 6/29/2005 (emphasis added). Claim 21 contains similar limitations as claim 8 and therefore claim 21 is rejected under the same rationale set forth to claim 8.

In response to applicant's argument about claim 7, the language of claim 7 only requires data structure is an XML data structure and constituting elements comprise tag names, attribute names and attribute values. There is no such term as the so-called "VALUE FREQ" as argued by applicant. Marashita clearly teaches the claimed invention of compressing and decompressing data structure tag document such as SGML data structure document with constituting elements comprise tags, character strings and codes [see Marashita, Figs. 13 & 32-33]. Thus, Marashita does teach or suggest data structure is an XML data structure and constituting elements comprise tag names, attribute names and attribute values.